

GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

(G.O. Rt. No. 114/Lab./AIL/J/2013, dated 6th August 2013)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an award in I.D. No. 14/2011, dated 30-5-2013 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the PONCOSM Workmen Association, Puducherry against the Managing Director, Pondicherry Co-operative Sugar Mills, Puducherry over seeking amendment of recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant(Regular) from the Cane Yard Supervisors, Shift Time-keepers and Junior Clerks (Total 22 workers) has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said award shall be published in the official gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

S. THAMMU GANAPATHY,

Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PUDUCHERRY

Present : Thiru T. MOHANDASS, M.A., M.L.,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court,
Puducherry.

Thursday, the 30th day of May 2013

I.D. No. 14/2011

The President,
PONCOSM Workmen Association . . . Petitioner

Versus

The Managing Director,
Pondicherry Co-operative Sugar Mills,
Lingareddipalayam, Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 30-5-2013 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiruvalargal L. Sathish, N. Krishnamurthy, T. Pravin and V. Veeraragavan, Advocates for the petitioner, Thiruvalargal K. Palaniappaan and R. Asvani Palaniappaan, Advocates for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, upon perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, this court passed the following :

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 110/AIL/Lab./J/2011, dated 27-5-2011 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,

(1) Whether the dispute raised by the PONCOSM Workmen Association against the management of M/s. Pondicherry Co-operative Sugar Mills seeking amendment of recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) from the post of the Cane Yard Supervisors, Shift Time-keepers and Junior Clerks (Total 22 workers, as mentioned in the Annexure) is justified or not?

(2) If justified, to what relief, the 22 workmen are entitled to?

(3) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed.

2. The petitioner, in his claim statement, has averred as follows:

The petitioner union represents the workmen of Puducherry Co-operative Sugar Mills, Lingareddipalayam, Puducherry and the present dispute is concerned with 22 workmen, the details of which are as follows:-

1. T. Sarathy, Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal)
2. M. Kandasamy, Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal)
3. N. Chidambaram, Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal)
4. D. Veerappan, Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal)
5. M. Ravichandran, Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal)
6. T. Palanisamy, Shift time-keeper (Seasonal)
7. D. Soundararajan, Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal)
8. G. Parthasarathy, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
9. G. Ponnurangam, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
10. R. Kuttiyapillai, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
11. R. Murali, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
12. R. Rajasekaran, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
13. M. Karunanithy, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
14. V. Vaikundavasagan, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
15. S. Janakiraman, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
16. S. Pandurangan, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
17. R. Kuppareddy, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
18. V. Venkatesan, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
19. C. Subramaniam, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
20. P. Ramachandran, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
21. I. Thirumurugan, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)
22. Kumar Ram, Junior Clerk (Seasonal)

The Cane Assistant is classified as Clerical Grade-III post. The Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers are also classified as Clerical Grade-III and the Junior Clerk (Seasonal) is classified as Clerical Grade-IV post. But the distinction between the Cane Assistant and the Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers is that Cane Assistant is a regular post, whereas, Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers are seasonal posts. Thus the seasonal workers are most prejudiced and outcast in any sugar mills. It is therefore, essential that every sugar mills must have appropriate recruitment rules to ensure that the seasonal workers are promoted or transferred to the post of their caliber which are regular in nature to ensure industrial peace and harmony to do complete justice to all its workers.

Ironically the recruitment rules of the respondent provides for Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) as feeder posts for the post of Cane Assistant. All the above three posts are classified in semi-skilled category in the pay scale of ₹ 900-15-1,050-20-1,250.

The Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Show Time-keepers (Seasonal) and Junior Clerks (Regular) are—

- (a) classified as skilled workers
- (b) placed in the higher category
- (c) in the higher grade of pay and
- (d) educationally better qualified experienced than the Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular), but for promoting/transferring/deputing to the post of Cane Assistant (Regular), the post of Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) which is lower in grade, scale of pay and educational qualification is considered ahead of the Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Shift Time-keepers (Seasonal) and Junior Clerks (Regular).

Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) are all regular posts enjoying full salary and full terminal benefits. Not only that, they only promotion avenue to the post of Junior Clerk (Regular) as it is a feeder post to Cane Yard Supervisor and Shift Time-keepers. But the Cane Yard Supervisor and Shows Time-keepers and Junior Clerk have absolutely no promotion avenue to any posts and all the above referred 22 workers are languishing in the same position for more than 20 years as seasonal workers, drawing only half

wages for six months of the year. All Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Show Time-keepers (Seasonal) and Junior Clerks (Regular), who have the requisite qualifications for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) must therefore be considered for transfer ahead of Cane Farm Maistry, Aerated Steam Therapy Operator and Afforestation Maistry.

The faulty recruitment rules of the respondent prescribing the lower grade post as feeder post for Cane Assistant ahead of the higher grade post of Cane Yard Supervisors, Shift Time-keepers and Junior Clerks has resulted in extreme injustice to the said 22 workers, as they have been deprived of any promotions for the past 25 years. Hence, this industrial dispute is filed to direct the respondent to amend its recruitment rules for promotion/transfer/deputation to the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) and provide for absorption of Cane Yard Supervisors (Seasonal), Shift Time-keepers (Seasonal) and Junior Clerks (Regular) for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) and consider the said 22 workmen, having necessary educational qualification for Cane Assistant to the existing vacancies of Cane Assistant to the existing vacancies of Cane Assistant (Regular) on seniority-*cum*-merit basis.

3. In the counter statement, the respondent has stated as follows:-

The prayer of the petitioner is untenable. If the recruitment rules framed for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) is found on adjudication to be either nor proper or unjust, such recruitment rules can only be set aside leaving the matter open to the respondent mills to appropriately framed the recruitment rules for the said post. This court cannot interfere either in policy making or in the process of administration by directing the mills to amend the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) in a particular manner. The workers belongs to the categories of Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) are to be made as parties to the dispute as they are necessary parties. The recruitment rules for the respondent mills was framed by constituting a committee under the Chairmanship of the then Law Officer by inviting representations from all sections of staff, employees' union, employees' association and individuals and considering all the pros and cons. The recruitment rules applicable to Junior Clerk (Seasonal), Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal) and Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal) do not prescribe any technical educational qualification or technical experience and consequently the said three posts are non-skilled. The workers from these three non-

skilled posts have chances of selection as Senior Clerks, Assistant Store-keeper and Typist all falling under Clerical Grade III. The recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) prescribe technical educational qualification and technical experience. The workers falling under technical category and non-technical category are not inter-changeable, nor the workers from the non-technical category can be transferred to the post of technical category even in cases, where the grade and the time scale of both the categories is the same.

Industrial activity of the respondent is seasonal in nature and consequently having regard to the nature of the work assigned to every post, certain posts are bound to be seasonal and therefore the workers falling under the seasonal post cannot claim the same right and privileges of those falling under regular category. Consequently, as claimed by the petitioners, the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant cannot be amended in such a way to just accommodate the petitioners and make them regular workers. Hence, they pray for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

4. On the side of the petitioner, PW.1 was examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P13 were marked. On the side of the respondent, no oral evidence was adduced, but marked Ex.R1 to Ex.R7 in the cross-examination of PW1.

5. *The point for determination is:*

Whether the industrial dispute can be allowed?

6. *On the point :*

There is no dispute that the Cane Assistant is classified as Clerical Grade-III post in the pay scale of ₹ 1,200-30-1,500-35-1,850, the Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers are also classified as Clerical Grade-III in the same pay scale of Cane Assistant and the Junior Clerk (Seasonal) is classified as Clerical Grade -IV post in the pay scale of ₹ 1,050-25-1,300-30-1,600, but the distinction between the Cane Assistant and the Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers is that Cane Assistant is a regular post, whereas, Cane Yard Supervisors and Shift Time-keepers are seasonal posts. There is also no dispute that the recruitment rules of the respondent provides for Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) as feeder posts for the post of Cane Assistant and all the above three posts are classified in semi-skilled category in the pay scale of ₹ 900-15-1,050-20-1,250. There is also no dispute that Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) are all regular posts enjoying full salary and full terminal benefits,

whereas, the Cane Yard Supervisors and the Shift Time-keepers will have work only for six months during seasons and for the next six months, they will be laid off on half salary.

7. The contention of the petitioner is that the Cane Yard Supervisor and Show Time-keepers and Junior Clerks have absolutely no promotion avenues to any posts and all the above referred 22 workers are languishing in the same position for more than 20 years as seasonal workers, drawing only half wages for six months of the year and all Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Show Time-keepers (Seasonal) and Junior clerks (Regular), who have the requisite qualifications for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) must therefore be considered for transfer ahead of Cane Farm Maistry, Aerated Steam Therapy Operator and Afforestation Maistry. In order to prove the claim of the petitioner, the Secretary of the petitioner union was examined as PW1. PW.1 in his evidence has deposed that the neighbouring mills of Chengalvarayan Co-operative Sugar Mills in Tamil Nadu prescribes promotion policy for the post of Cane Assistant by selecting the workers of higher grade on a preferential basis ahead of other workers which is more logical and reasonable.

8. *Per contra*, the contention of the respondent is that this court cannot interfere either in policy making or in the process of administration by directing the mills to amend the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) in a particular manner and therefore the terms of reference are misleading and consequently the reference itself is bad in law.

9. In this regard, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the Labour Court has no power or authority to decide the legality, validity and propriety of the reference made to it and it is the duty of the Labour Court to adjudicate the dispute and to pass appropriate award. In order to support his claim, he relied upon the following decisions:-

CDJ 2007 MHC 4233 (Madras High Court):

“Industrial Tribunal is the creation statute and it gets jurisdiction on the basis of the reference. It cannot go into the question on validity of the reference.”

(2002) 4 GLR 3093 (Gujarat High Court):-

“However, it is a settled law that once the reference has been made to the Labour Court for adjudication of the dispute, then the Labour Court has no power or authority to decide the legality, validity and propriety of the reference made to it. The Labour Court cannot examine the legality, validity and propriety of such reference as an appellate or higher forum over the decision taken by the authority.

On the contrary, it is the duty of the Labour Court to adjudicate the dispute and to pass appropriate award."

10. The present dispute was originally raised by the petitioners before the Labour Officer (Conciliation). The respondent attended the conciliation, but they did not claim that such a dispute cannot be raised before the Labour Officer (Conciliation). The conciliation failed and based on the failure report, the appropriate Government satisfied itself that there exists an industrial dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, which is capable of being adjudicated by this court and hence referred it to this court with specific mandate to decide the justification of demand raised by the petitioners for amendment of recruitment rules. The reference is not to decide whether the Labour Court has powers to adjudicate the industrial dispute raised by the petitioner. The said reference can only be answered by this court on the merits of the subject matter and the validity of the said reference cannot be questioned before this court, as held in the above decisions.

11. The contention of the learned counsel for the respondent is that the Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal) and Junior Clerks (Seasonal) are non-technical categories and they do not subscribe to technical educational qualifications whereas, Cane Farm Maistry, Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) are the technical posts and therefore the petition mentioned workers, who are non-technical categories cannot seek promotion in technical categories.

12. The Cane Assistant Regular is a Clerical Grade-III with a pay scale of ₹ 1,200-30-1,500-35-1,850. Similarly the posts of Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal) are also Clerical Grade-III with a pay scale of ₹ 1,200-30-1,500-35-1,850. But the posts of Cane Farm Maistry (Regular), Aerated Steam Therapy Operator (Regular) and Afforestation Maistry (Regular) as feeder posts for the post of Cane Assistant and all these posts are classified in semi-skilled category in the pay scale of ₹ 900-15-1,050-20-1,250. Hence, the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) and that of Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal), Shift Time Keeper (Seasonal) are identical in nature except for the fact that the former is regular post but the latter two are seasonal. Merely because a technical certificate is prescribed for the post of Cane Assistant, it cannot become a technical post. Therefore, either promotion or transfer or deputation from Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal) and Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal) to the post of Cane Assistant shall be obvious and shall be preferred at least for those candidates, who are possessing the requisite technical qualification required for Cane Assistant (Regular).

13. On the side of the petitioner, the recruitment rules for Cane Assistant and other posts has been marked as Ex.P1. Column 13 of Ex.P1 specifically provides that whenever persons in feeder post are not found suitable for being promoted as Cane Assistants, then eligible in service candidates from other sections in pay scale of ₹ 1,200-30-1-500-35-1,850 shall be considered and thereafter persons in the lower grades also can be considered gradewise". As stated above, the Cane Yard Supervisor (Seasonal) and Shift Time-keeper (Seasonal) are in the requisite pay scale and it is mandatory for the respondents to consider them for promotion/transfer to the posts of Cane Assistants as per the above recruitment rules. However, the respondent has not promoted or transferred any of the Cane Yard Supervisor and Shift Time-keeper to the posts of Cane Assistant (Regular).

14. The learned counsel for the respondent has submitted that this court cannot interfere either in policy making or in the process of administration by directing the mills to amend the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) in a particular manner. In this regard it is pertinent to refer the following decision which is relevant to this case:-

1962 AIR(SC) 486:-

Bidi Bidi leaves and apos; and Tobacco Merchants Association Versus State of Bombay:-

"It is well settled that industrial adjudication under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) is given wide powers and jurisdiction to make appropriate awards in determining industrial disputes brought before it. An award made in an industrial adjudication may impose new obligations on the employer in the interest of social justice and with a view to secure peace and harmony between the employer and his workmen and full co-operation between them. Such an award may even alter the terms of employment, if it is thought if and necessary to do so. In deciding industrial disputes the jurisdiction of the tribunal is not confined to the administration of justice in accordance with the law of contract. Mukherjee, J. as he then was, has observed in *The Bharat Bank Limited, Delhi Versus Employees'* of the Bharat Bank Limited, Delhi (1950 SCR 459, 513), the Tribunal "Can confer rights and privileges on either party which it considers reasonable and proper, though they may not be within the terms of any existing agreement. It has not merely to interpret or give effect to the contractual rights and obligations between them which it considers essential for keeping industrial peace." Since the decision of the Federal Court in *Western India Automobile Association Versus Industrial Tribunal, Bombay* (AIR 1949 F.C.111, 1949 F.C.321), it has been repeatedly held that the jurisdiction of industrial tribunals is much wider and can be

reasonably exercised in deciding industrial disputes with the object of keeping industrial peace and progress [(Vide: Rohtas Industries Limited, *Versus* Brijnandan Pandey (1956 S.C.R.800); The Patna Electric Supply Company Limited, *Versus* Patna *Versus* The Patna Electric Supply Workers' Union (1959 Supp. 2 S.C.R. 761)]. Indeed, during the last ten years and more industrial adjudication in this country has made so much progress in determining industrial disputes arising between industries of different kinds and their employees that the jurisdiction and authority of industrial tribunals to deal with such disputes with the object of ensuring social justice is no longer seriously disputed. But it is necessary to remember that no claim can be made for such broad jurisdiction power by the respondent when it purports to issue a notification under the provisions of the Act. These powers and authority would necessarily be conditioned by the relevant provisions under which it purports to act and the validity of the impugned notification must therefore be judged not by general considerations of social justice or even considerations for introducing industrial peace; they must be judged solely and exclusively by the test prescribed by the provisions of the statute itself."

2005(3) LLN. 719 (Madras) :

National Small Industries Corporation Limited, Chennai Versus Presiding Officer, I Additional Labour Court, Madras and Another:-

"The whole approach of industrial law is that the employer and employee do not stand on an equal bargaining position. Industrial law recognises that the workers are in a weaker position than the employers who have financial resources, management skills, connections, etc. Hence the whole object of industrial law is to help the weaker section in the society (the workmen) and given them protection from exploitation. There can be no estoppel against a person, who accepts his designation as an apprentice, but later on raises a plea that in fact he was not an apprentice but was doing the work of a workman."

1982 I L.L.J. 33 S.C.:

Workmen of M/s. Williamson Magor and Company Limited Versus William Magor and Company Limited:

"This court in the case of K.C.P. Employees Association, Madras *Versus* Management of KCP Limited, Madras and other reported in (1977 I L.L.J. 322) observed:

"In industrial law, interpreted and applied in the perspective of Part-IV of the Constitution, the benefit of reasonable doubt, on law and facts, if there be such doubt must go to the weaker section,

labour. The Tribunal will dispose of the case making this compassionate approach but without over stepping the proved facts."

As per the first decision cited above, the Labour Court is much wider and can be reasonably exercised in deciding industrial disputes with the object of keeping industrial peace and progress. As per the second and third decisions cited above, the employees of the respondent, who are from weaker section of the society, should not be exploited by the management, those who are in higher position. In this case, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the faulty recruitment rules of the respondent prescribing the lower grade post as feeder post for Cane Assistant ahead of the higher grade post of Cane Yard Supervisors, Shift Time-keepers and Junior Clerks has resulted in extreme injustice to the said 22 workmen as they have been deprived of any promotions for the past 25 years and it is shameful that the workers in junior category and in lower pay scale are being promoted ahead of the 22 members, which is unjust and demotivating not only that it affects the petitioner's members monetarily too. Considering the arguments put forth by the learned counsel for the petitioner and considering the facts that the petition mentioned workmen are languishing in the same position for more than 20 years as seasonal workers drawing only half wages for six months of the year and being guided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the above decision, I feel that the amendment of recruitment rules of the respondent for the post of Cane Assistant will pave way to them for better prospects and accordingly, the respondent is hereby directed to amend its recruitment rules for promotion/transfer/deputation to the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) and consider the petition mentioned workmen for the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) to the existing vacancies on seniority-cum-merit basis. This point is answered accordingly.

15. In the result, the industrial dispute is allowed and the respondent is directed to amend its recruitment rules for promotion/transfer/deputation to the post of Cane Assistant (Regular) and consider the petition mentioned workmen for Cane Assistant (Regular) to the existing vacancies on seniority-cum-merit basis. However, in the circumstances of the case, there is no order as to costs.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this 30th day of May 2013.

T. MOHANDASS,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Puducherry.

List of witnesses examined for the petitioner:

PW.1 — 15-9-2012 - Pandurangan

*List of witnesses examined for the respondent: Nil**List of exhibits marked for the petitioner:*

Ex.P1 — Photocopy of the recruitment rules of respondent.

Ex.P2 — Copy of the letter given by member of petitioner's union, dated 18-12-2008.

Ex.P3 — Copy of the letter, dated 2-12-2008 given by the petitioner union to Lieutenant-Governor.

Ex.P4 — Copy of the letter given by the petitioner's union to the respondent, dated 28-2-2009.

Ex.P5 — Copy of the letter given by petitioner union to the respondent, dated 28-10-2009.

Ex.P6 — Copy of the letter given by petitioner union, dated 30-3-2009 to Labour Officer.

Ex.P7 — Copy of the letter, dated 5-11-2009 given by petitioner union to respondent.

Ex.P8 — Copy of the letter, dated 9-1-2010 given by petitioner union to respondent.

Ex.P9 — Copy of the letter, dated 28-2-2010 given by the petitioner union to the Labour Department.

Ex.P10 — Copy of the letter, dated 1-2-2010 given by the respondent to Labour Department.

Ex.P11 — Copy of the letter given by Chengalvarayan Co-operative Sugar Mills, dated 13-5-2010.

Ex.P12 — Copy of the letter given by respondent to Chengalvarayan Co-operative Sugar Mills.

Ex.P13 — Copy of the failure report, dated 10-12-2010.

List of exhibits marked for the respondent:

Ex.R1 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Yard Supervisor .

Ex.R2 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Shift Time-keeper.

Ex.R3 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Junior Clerk.

Ex.R4 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Assistant.

Ex.R5 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Cane Farm Maistry.

Ex.R6 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Aerated Steam Therapy Unit Operator.

Ex.R7 — Copy of the recruitment rules for the post of Maistry (Afforestation).

T. MOHANDASS,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Puducherry.

ETAT DE PUDUCHÉRY
SERVICE DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT

No. (Exam.) 35/Edn./DD/FE/EC.

Puduchéry, le 14 Juin 2013.

**PROGRAMME LIMITATIF SUR LEQUEL SERONT SUBIES LES EPREUVES DU BREVET ELEMENTAIRE EN
2013-2014**

I. MORALE ET INSTRUCTION CIVIQUE

1. La devise républicaine.
2. La déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen
3. Les principes de base de la constitution de l'Inde.
4. Ecologie - Conservation de la nature et lutte contre la pollution de la nature.
5. Le respect de la pensée et de la religion - La tolérance.
6. Le patriotisme et lutte contre le terrorisme.
7. L'intégration nationale.
8. Devoir de participer à la vie nationale par l'information exacte, par le vote de l'acceptation des charges-publiques, par la contribution aux dépenses du service public, par l'acceptation des sacrifices, par le sentiment nationale.